

Historic, archived document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

NO. 30

JANUARY 10, 1935

EXECUTIVE AND PERSONNEL
MANAGEMENT
ON THE
NATIONAL FORESTS



A MEDIUM FOR THE EXCHANGE OF IDEAS AND
EXPERIENCES BY OPERATING EXECUTIVES
FOR THE BETTERMENT OF THE
SERVICE

CONFIDENTIAL - FOR SERVICE MEMBERS ONLY

CONTENTS

Land-Use Planning Studies	
Introductory Statement.....	3
Development of Land-Use Planning in the United States..	
By F. A. Ineson.....	4
Land-Use Planning.....	7
Reviews	
What Is National Planning.....	10
Rural Land-Use Planning.....	11
Land Use in Relation to Agricultural Adjustment.....	12
State Land-Settlement Problems and Policies in the United States.....	13
Bibliography.....	16
Suggestions for Discussion.....	17
Discussions of Previous Lessons	
By Roy E. Miller.....	18
H. R. Hughes.....	20
J. V. Leighou.....	21

LAND-USE PLANNING STUDIES

Introductory Statement

At the Ogden conference in November it was decided that in our discussions this winter we should take up the subject of land-use planning. It is the most important subject we have attempted since our cost-accounting study six years ago. In that study we discussed an old and well-established science, but one whose technique had never been successfully adapted to our work. In land-use planning, as shown in the "reviews" and in Ineson's paper, we are dealing with a science in the making. It is one to which we have given considerable thought, as have many others, but no recognized technique has been developed.

In the cost-accounting study the Regional Foresters designated several officers to represent them and the needs of their Region. Possibly that would be best in this, but I have not as yet suggested it.

The subject is probably newer to me than to any of you, but in order to get started I have tentatively blocked out the following outline as a guide. As the discussions develop it is quite probable that they will show that other subjects should be worked in. If so, the outline can be revised. This is it:

I

General Planning Idea History, Definition

II

Objectives of Planning Social, Economic, Ecological

III

Direct Relationship of Planning to: a. Local Populations b. State, Adjoining States, Nation

IV

Basis of Planning—Inventories Includes What and Why?

V

The Multiple Use Idea What It Means and How

VI

The Forest Plan As a Land-Use Plan. What?

This outline already appears weak on application. Of course, our chief objective is to help each other and learn from each other; a lot of planning will be done, and some of you will spend a lot of time on it. Will our discussions help you to make better plans?—P. K.

DEVELOPMENT OF LAND-USE PLANNING IN THE UNITED STATES

By F. A. INESON

One hundred years prior to the enactment of the law providing for the setting aside of national forest reserves from the public domain a Frenchman presented the now famous L'Enfant Plan for the capital of the United States. It is recognized as the first conscious effort of the new republic to plan intelligently, and was designed to accommodate 100,000 people, whom it was then estimated would be the ultimate population of the nation's capital. Although today more than 500,000 persons call Washington, D. C., their home, the framework of the L'Enfant Plan remains almost intact.

But, as one reviews the ensuing 100 years in the settlement of this country, he finds little evidence of the influence of this initial planning. Our amazing expansion has been accompanied by haphazard development and a rapacious use of our natural resources. In 1780 the assembled fathers of our country provided that the "public domain" which was ceded to the national government by the respective states should be disposed of to the common benefit of all citizens. And then followed the familiar series of congressional acts which made possible the distribution of most of our original public domain and that later acquired.

We must at least credit our governing forefathers with good intentions. The Homestead Act was designed to provide each and every family with the opportunity to call a tract of wilderness his own; the Railroad Grants, to make possible transportation into the wilderness; the Swamp Land Grants, to assist the states in becoming financially established; the grants for educational institutions, to aid the settlers in maintaining cultural standards in their isolated situations. These acts and others constituted the public land policy of the nineteenth century.

Today our hindsight envisions the potentialities of substituting long-range planned development for the haphazard course followed. We can look out over areas of denuded forests, of eroded and impoverished fields and ranges, of isolated settlements, of mines stripped of their wealth, and consider measures which we now believe would have resulted in improved physical, economic and social conditions. The era of "rugged individualism" was an era of "laissez faire"; the promotion of the general welfare through the aggressive endeavors of undisciplined self-interest. That the general welfare of the present generation was promoted will not be denied; that the heritage of future generations was wasted in the process will be admitted.

An individual readily appreciates the application of planning principles in the location, design and furnishing of his own home. He knows that provision for regulated temperature, for sanitation, and for household facilities will pay dividends in the comfort, health and happiness of his family. It is not a great deal more difficult to interest him in the problems of his community, in the provision of roads, schools, churches and parks. But it becomes progressively

LAND-USE PLANNING

When confronted with the problem of initiating a series of discussions on land-use planning, my first efforts were directed toward finding out what it is all about. Men have used land from the beginning of time, and men have planned. Then what is there new in this new movement?

The new idea, it seems to me, is just a greater emphasis on use and a greater interest in the needs of the group instead of the individual—the welfare of communities and regions in terms of people instead of volume of business. It is more a change in point of view than in results desired. We always have been interested in prosperous, happy communities.

But the old idea (still held by most people in a more or less modified form) was that the way to promote prosperous communities is to get all the land into private ownership. The owner will then put the land to its highest use, since it is to his own interest to do so. This theory is based on the idea that the highest social use is also the highest individual use, and that the individual will seek, find and follow this best use. This belief is, in fact, the basis for private ownership.

Ownership is so common and so universally accepted that we seldom think of it as having a basis; we just take it for granted. Ownership in land, however, is virtually a contract. The control of all land belongs with the State. The State grants to the individual certain privileges in the use of a definite area, in return for which the individual assumes certain obligations and responsibilities. If the individual fails, the State cancels the contract (deed). There is no justification for the saying, “we can do what we please with our own.” We can do only what the contract allows, and that varies in different countries. To be sure, it comes near being “anything” in our own country. This is the “contract theory” of land ownership, and the one generally accepted.

Since we believed that private ownership would automatically bring about the greatest public good in land use, the public planning of the past has been primarily settlement planning. Most of our land policies, and most of our land legislation, has dealt with settlement. I give in another place a brief review of a Bulletin on this subject. I have here on my desk a book published in 1917 on “Rural Planning and Development” in Canada. It deals almost entirely with plans for encouraging settlement. So we have not been alone in this. It resulted from the situation, as well as our economic beliefs.

That owners will seek and find the highest use of their land sounds reasonable in theory, but in practice too often they seem unable or unwilling to do so. Then, too, even if they did, some people are beginning to doubt whether or not the two interests always coincide. Private interest seems at times to indicate cutting the timber when public interest does not. The President has said that on his trip over the country in 1920, “The one great impression I got of our country was that it had grown up like Topsy, wandering around for over 300 years, opening up new lands and new territories, and because the country was so vast nobody seemed to suffer. In these latter days we have come to the end

of limitless opportunities, of new places to go and new industries to start in operation. The time is ripe, and over-ripe, for the beginning of planning, of planning to correct the errors of the past." Everyone knows of these errors in land use—and abuse—many of them. But few people know how to correct them.

In fact, nobody does, but the present movement is a widespread attempt to find out. A lot of men are studying the question, and now they are not so much concerned with private profit as they once were. They are considering more the general social welfare and the elimination of waste. It is not concerned with the elimination of private ownership in land, but only in changing the terms of the "contract." It would protect society's interests and increase the obligations of the contractor. Why permit him to destroy for all time our best farm land and to try to replace it by clearing other land suited only to trees? Or why permit him to farm where the social service he requires costs the community more than the total value of his crops?

Along with this idea of proper use goes a new emphasis and a new concept of *use*. The new planning is *use* planning as contrasted with the settlement planning and the profits planning of the past. Not that we are going away from profits entirely, they have their place, but there are things, such as game, for example, that we do not want to put on a profit-production basis. With the emphasis on use, such things are coming more into the foreground, and on a better basis. If your emphasis is on use, there will be game provided where it is accessible and will be used, but there will not be so much pressure for intensive game management in remote areas, where few hunters ever go. Likewise, in the past, most of our federally owned parks and playgrounds have been in the far West, while what the great majority of us need is an area close enough to where we live and work that we can afford to visit it occasionally. The emphasis on use is going to help correct things of this kind. Not only in these things, but in the industrial uses also, will this new emphasis be felt. Possibly in our own resource plans we may make some changes when we begin to think more of use and less of the resource itself.

Another idea of the planning movement is that in these times of social stress other than farm lands should contribute more than they do to population support as well as to social benefits in health and happiness. Something like 48 per cent of our rural lands are not in farms. The forests, parks and ranges should be made to contribute more useful work than they have during the unplanned period of the past. Possibly foresters know more about how this can be done than any other single group. That is one reason why they should study the land-planning movement.

The greatest difficulty in the way of this new type of planning is our own human limitations—our inability to get away from old ideas and traditions and old ways of thinking and doing. We just naturally cannot think in the new terms. We can all talk easily in generalities about social welfare and highest use, but when it comes right down to cases in planning things to do, each group drops back into old thought habits and begins trying to find ways to profit from the movement; each wonders how he is going to get something out

of it. The timber owner looks upon the movement as a change to saddle more of the burden of carrying his investment on the public; the stockman expects to get a right in the range; the irrigationist expects that from it the public will protect and assure his water supply; the industrialist hopes the public will improve transportation for his benefit; each State hopes and expects to benefit its industries even at the expense of other States, and all foresters are sure that they can so manipulate the movement that they will profit from the increased public interest in forestry. I would not criticize or blame any one of these interests for their attitude toward or interest in the movement. It is an expression of our heritage from the past. We cannot hope to get entirely away from it. All that we can do is to recognize it and try to keep it in bounds. And after all it may be a good thing. The various interests, each with its specialized information, help to get all the facts before the planning boards, and the "parallelogram of forces" resulting from the various pulls may give us better balanced plans than could otherwise be gotten. Anyhow, it seems to be an interesting game.

Now just a word about who is doing the planning and who is doing the talking. As it appears to an outsider, the "City Planners" come first. They have looked upon it as a new and broader field, or as an extension of their old job to include more territory. Anyhow, a lot of them are getting into the work and are bringing with them their old technique. They continue to emphasize recreation, transportation and zoning, the three things with which they were most concerned in city plans. That is why we are hearing so much about these things now. This group includes a number of capable men, and seems really to give a lot of color, if not actual direction, to the movement.

Next comes the statisticians. They find in it great masses of figures to juggle and put together in new ways and make them mean, or seem to mean, new things. These figures include populations, acres, transportation units, production units, and many other things. They are contributing their part.

Third, or possibly first, comes the various groups of conservationists, including foresters. They are concerned most, apparently, with the devastated areas—the drained swamps, the denuded forests, the plowed-up dry prairies that cannot be farmed. So much have they said that to many people land-use planning means conservation, and conservation means caring for the much-abused submarginal areas.

And last I would put the men who have done most of the actual planning so far, but who are not, in the layman's mind, associated with the movement at all, the Secretary and his A. A. A. Division. They have taken hundreds of thousands of acres of the best wheat land, and cotton land, and tobacco land, etc., out of production. That is planning that gets results in a big way, and gets them now. I put them last only because most of their work so far is preliminary and temporary. After a production balance is reached, their work must be put on a permanent basis, and it must be correlated with the zoning and so forth of the other groups. Land-use planning may develop into a really big job—P. K.

REVIEWS

What Is National Planning? By Arthur C. Comey, Assistant Professor, Harvard School of City Planning. Published in *City Planning*, October, 1933.

"By national planning we mean planning for the physical or material development of the nation for human use and enjoyment." It means exercising foresight, and directing human efforts according to a scheme for the entire nation. It is a type of regional planning—for the ultimate region. It seeks to relate cities and towns and the vast rural areas one with another, and to balance size and development so as to advantageously accommodate the actual number of people probable at any given time. It also must pay some attention to those possible phases of world development which may affect the nation's welfare. Also, while it influences and is influenced by social and political factors, it deals only with the physical environment of men.

It determines, therefore, the uses to which land and natural resources are to be put. It seeks to establish an environmental pattern most favorable to the public welfare. It replaces drifting, subject to the forces of nature and the personal goals of men, with a program of work distributed over a period of years which, even though imperfect as it may be, will result in greater effectiveness and the saving of untold wealth. It is not just a theory, but is actually being brought into the field of practical application.

The scope of national planning is not yet known, and will change as time goes on. While it must be done with due regard to facts and trends, it needs most a zealous creative attitude that is not subservient to them. At the same time there is little to be gained by trying immediately to embrace matters not at present subject to planned control.

In all types of regional planning there are a number of existing general conditions that must be studied. These include climate, topography, geology in its general aspects, watershed areas, sociological conditions and land classification. Coordinated with these permanent features will be the use of land and resources—raw materials and their conservation and extraction, reserves for various purposes, population patterns, and transportation. These must be further broken down and subdivided for study and application.

Planning of the population pattern in relation to industry, trade and culture involves a study of social and economic factors and trends, the population of the nation at any particular time, the relation of raw materials to industrial centers, and the relative merits of many small cities or large, metropolitan areas. Transportation is also studied, especially the relative utilization and merits of the various methods, and also their coordination and inter-relations. Among special problems is the influence of transportation rates on the distribution of industry and the population pattern.

And most of all is the consideration of ways and means—the relation to unemployment relief, public works and the legislative possibilities for insuring the orderly carrying out of the plan in the actual progressive development of our physical environment.

Rural Land-Use Planning: By L. R. Schoenmann, Regional Director, Land Policy Section, A. A. A. A paper presented at the National Conference on City, Regional, State, and National Planning, held at St. Louis in October, 1934.

In this brief of Dr. Schoenmann's paper the first paragraph is quoted in full; after that it follows his text rather closely, using his own words rather freely without attempting in all cases to designate the use.

"The art and science of city planning is now well established. Years of study and practice in city planning have defined its scope and provided a recognized set of principles and objectives. Trial and error have perfected a methodology for applying these principles to the problem at hand and a procedure for attaining the desired objective."

But no such thing can be said of rural planning. It is just starting on the trial-and-error stage. A methodology must be developed. Several States have made a start. Wisconsin has pioneered in zoning. Others have studied the social and political consequences of unplanned use. Altogether there is a considerable volume of factual data and experience, but it must be interpreted and oriented to make it applicable to the problems the past has left and the future will bring.

Cities are occupied and used because of the service they perform. City planning aims to provide the physical character most suitable for the performance of this service. It developed only after unplanned development began to interfere with the city's business or the health and happiness of its people.

Likewise with rural planning. We have used our rural lands in too haphazard a manner. We have encouraged farms where farming was foredoomed to fail; we have overgrazed, drained, cleared, slashed and burned; we have destroyed our wild life, and now we quarrel as to who will get its half-starved ruminants; we have reserved parks in the distant mountains, accessible only to those who need them least.

And while we have done and are doing these things, we babble abstractly of a land-use program that will insure the highest social and economic use for all lands and provide the greatest good for the largest number.

What else do you expect? It has taken us about 300 years to get into this mess, so do not expect to get out overnight. Undue haste or wholesale remedies might prove disastrous. The laws, customs, and traditions of the past are deep rooted. Their replacement will be a slow and possibly painful process. So don't start out looking for Holy Grails.

Among the outstanding results of the past are, on the one hand, millions of idle men, and on the other, millions and more millions of idle acres. How simple of solution! Just put the idle men on the idle acres and both questions are solved. Too many of our proposed solutions are like that. First, the idle lands are poor lands. Second, the idle men have nothing with which to start. Besides, there is too much farming, anyhow.

So it looks bad. But there may be something to it after all. A lot of this

unfarmed land may be made to furnish part-time jobs. Some of it is eroding, and needs protection. Much of it could be made into wild-life ranges or into parks and forests. In these and other ways many of the idle men could find employment that would contribute to the health and happiness of all.

This is only a part of the job of rural land planning. It and other obviously aggravated examples of maladjustment in land use are being attacked through demonstration projects in order to determine, through actual experience rather than theory, how more of our citizens can be returned to the land.

Land Use in Relation to Agricultural Adjustment: By H. R. Tolley, Assistant Administrator and Director, Program Planning Division, A. A. A. Paper read before the Extension Conference at Ames, Iowa, in October, 1934.

Those parts of the many-sided New Deal program dealing with the use of land have seemed too many, to be confused, unrelated or even contradictory. People with fertile crop land have been urged to keep a part of it out of production, while other people attempt to farm marginal and submarginal land. Why don't we take the poor land out of production first? And why do we try to put more people on land—the subsistence homesteads—when there are already too many? Also, what about foreign markets? Does the Administration want more or fewer people on the land? Will these things being done really raise the standard of living, or will it bring us all down to the subsistence level?

To understand the moves being made one must understand something of the total situation, and also must realize that some things are for immediate relief and some are of a more permanent nature. The first thing in farm planning was to size up the plant, its capacity, and its probable market. In the years just preceding the depression we find that 287,000,000 acres were used to grow crops for home use and 44,000,000 acres for export. The export market has and probably will still further decrease.

As to our home needs, that is a variable depending not alone on population. Expert dietitians have computed that on the cheapest possible diet, consisting largely of cereals, our population can be fed from the products of 180,000,000 acres. On the other hand, with the highest form of diet, consisting largely of dairy products, lean meat, eggs, fruit and vegetables, it will take 335,000,000 acres. If everyone would change at once to this expensive diet there would be no need to reduce acreage. But they cannot. Even with the purchasing power to do so, people change their dietetic habits slowly. Long-time planning must take this into consideration. Immediate planning cannot. Likewise with exports. Immediate planning provides for no increase.

As to methods for reducing the plant, the most desirable one would be to retire the poorest land and the isolated tracts that occasion the highest per capita social expenditures. Both these things are being done, but both take time. The poorer lands are being retired through purchase by the Federal government, through the withholding from sale of tax delinquent land by the states, and through zoning by states and counties. The acquisition of land is moving forward rapidly, but it is necessarily time consuming. Studies must be

made to determine critical areas and to keep a proper balance. Furthermore, land must be examined and appraised. It is at best a five- or ten-year undertaking.

The long-time program involves also the expansion of export markets and the increase in purchasing power at home which will shift consumption toward the more-acreage demanding diet. The adjustment act provides for the more immediate adjustments in acreage that are necessary while the others are getting under way.

So far we have considered only the land, but land changes involve people. With the need for fewer acres goes the need for taking care of a greatly increased farm population. The increase consists largely of two crops: first, the excess of farm population, which in the past has gone into industrial work in the cities, but which, during the last four years, has had no such outlet; and second, the thousands of farm-reared people who, having lost their jobs in industry, have come back to the farm. Long-time planning must take care of these groups and also the people who are being removed from the submarginal land.

One constructive remedy that is being tried is the "rural industrial community." These provide for housing people on land where they can raise much of their own food and providing them with part-time employment. So far not much progress has been made. Suitable industries are difficult to launch. But studies are being made and plans are going forward. Quite a number of stranded farmers can be used on improving the usefulness of land acquired by both state and nation.

"Progress made thus far under the A. A. A. and other New Deal measures shows that the American people can largely shape their own destiny if they will. This is the only kind of 'planned economy' possible in a democracy. The planning which Americans are now doing is not the kind which involves dictation and regimentation from above, but rather the provision for their common future, which comes when people sit down together and think out their own affairs."

State Land-Settlement Problems and Policies in the United States: By W. A. Hartman. Technical Bulletin No. 357, Department of Agriculture.

The purpose of including here in our first lesson on land-use planning a brief review of this bulletin is to emphasize the fact known to all of you, that up to this time land planning in this country has been almost entirely settlement planning. It has been a basic part of our philosophy that "use" would take care of itself once all the land was in private ownership. But "outgrown and inadequate public, semi-public and private land-settlement policies are to a certain degree responsible for some of the recent difficulties experienced by American agriculture." The general policy of the Government has been, and still is, to make land easily available to the individual, and to leave him free to make his selection, finance it, and do with it as he likes. This was, of course, a natural outgrowth of the situation. There was a surplus of land. The popula-

tion was increasing. Industrial centers were developing. Export markets seemed permanent.

But finally the situation changed, while the promotion of settlement continued. The result, as everyone now knows, is that settlement has been carried too far, and that there is now in cultivation some 50,000,000 acres more than is needed to supply the market. In addition to this there are the scars left by past mistakes, in defunct drainage, levee and irrigation projects, abandoned farms, and disorganized and declining communities, doomed to failure. The same wasteful methods, with similar results, have been applied to timber and mineral lands.

Dr. Hartman says that there is great need for the determination of the economic potentialities of land for farming as compared with grazing, forestry, recreation, and other uses, and the formulation and application of programs based on the facts assembled. This bulletin is intended as an aid to the construction of such programs in that it reviews what has been done in the past and gives data on present use and population distribution.

In the beginning, and almost down to the present time, the only use given real consideration was agriculture. So land was classed as farms or undeveloped. The undeveloped land was further classified as to its susceptibility to cultivation. Forests were to be cleared, swamps drained and dry land irrigated. States were very reluctant to admit that they had land which could not be in some manner brought under cultivation. But first it must be transferred to private ownership. So we had the homestead law, the preemption act, and when these tended to become inactive, the drainage law and the various irrigation and desert land laws, until now practically all land cultivated or susceptible of cultivation, and much that is neither, is privately owned.

In addition to transferring land to individual farmers direct, the government ceded large acreages to the States and to private agencies, notably the railroads. This made each of these recipients an additional agency for the promotion of settlement.

The methods used by the States have differed materially from those of the Federal government. The State is interested not so much in the disposal of its land as it is in increasing its population and industry. New and prosperous farming communities mean increased business for private enterprises and increased tax money for public service. Too frequently, however, the zeal for new settlers obscured the consequences of permitting sparse settlement or settlement doomed to failure by poor soil or other reasons. Decaying communities and disillusioned settlers are state liabilities, not assets. This fact has not been recognized until recently.

In promoting settlement, public and private institutions have used much the same forms of advertising. These include "extravagant posters and printed material scattered broadcast through the mails; exhibition trains decked with banners and loaded with fruits, vegetables, and grains impossible to duplicate under ordinary farming conditions; homeseekers' excursions; elaborate exhibi-

tions and professional lectures, and virtual promises of quick and easy riches."

The State does not confine its advertising to its own land. Its purpose is to increase business through increasing the acreage in production. For this reason many States advertise private land sales. Ten States publish descriptions of farms for sale or rent. West Virginia publishes semi-monthly a list of farms for sale; about 50,000 copies are distributed monthly. In some parts of the country advertisements are now featuring recreation more than agriculture.

Quite a number of Western States have gone far beyond just advertising, and have tried more direct means of helping settlers to locate and get started. One common means has been the "ready-made farm"—the State installs the improvements and sells the farm, on a liberal payment plan, ready for use. The bulletin describes a number of attempts of this kind.

While expenditures for settlement purposes have been very greatly curtailed during these depression years, laws have not been repealed, and promotion will begin again when times get better, in spite of the fact that the Federal government is trying to regulate production; that is, unless the planning movement takes hold with sufficient impetus to control.

It is now pretty generally admitted that the old free-and-easy expansion philosophy has outlived its usefulness. What we need now is to guide and control settlement, directing it to the better land where roads, schools and other facilities are already established. The first step is to license real estate dealers and to pass uniform blue sky laws. The next is to coordinate agriculture with all other forms of land use through integrated programs to which agencies, federal, state, and private, concur. Such programs must be based strictly on the best obtainable factual data, and not on individual desires or political preference. Progress in that direction is now exceedingly rapid.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The short bibliography presented herewith has been selected to give a broad picture of the development of land-use planning through the eyes of a number of individuals who have participated in its development.

ADAMS, THOMAS. Rural planning and development: a study of rural conditions and problems in Canada.

Ottawa Commission of Conservation, Canada, 1917.

BAKER, O. E., AND GRAY, L. C., ZON, R., ET AL. The utilization of our lands for crops, pasture, and forests.

U. S. Department of Agriculture Yearbook, 1923; pp. 415-506.

BLACK, JOHN D., AND HARTMAN, W. A. Economic aspects of land settlement in the cut-over region of the Great Lake States.

U. S. Department of Agriculture, Circular No. 160, April, 1931; 86 pp.

CRANE, JACOB L., JR. The Iowa Conservation plan: its bearing upon general land planning.

Journal of Land and Public Utilities Economics, Aug., 1933; 9; pp. 247-52.

DELANO, FREDERIC A. How and where will our children live?

Nation's Business, Jan., 1930; 18:1; pp. 41-43, 158, 160.

EKE, P. A., AND PECK, M., FRANK, B. Economic utilization of marginal lands in Nicholas and Webster Counties, West Virginia.

U. S. Department of Agriculture, Technical Bulletin No. 303, May, 1932; pp. 1-64.

ELY, RICHARD T., AND WEHRWEIN, G. S. Land economics.

Edwards Brothers, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1931; 165 pp. Lithoprinted.

GRAY, LEWIS CECIL. The field of land utilization.

Journal of Land and Public Utilities Ec., April, 1925; 1; pp. 152-59.

JAMES, HARLEAN. Land planning in the United States for the city, state and nation.

City Planning Publishing Co., 9 Park Street, Boston (or Macmillan Co., New York), 1926; 427 pp.

LOVEJOY, P. S. Concepts and contours in land utilization.

Journal of Forestry, April, 1933.

MACKAYE, BENTON. The new exploration: a philosophy of regional planning.

New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1928.

ROWLANDS, W. A. County zoning for agriculture, forestry and recreation in Wisconsin.

Journal of Land and Public Utility Economics, Aug., 1933; 9; p. 272.

ZON, RAPHAEL. Land-use planning by the states.

Journal of Farm Economics; 15:2; pp. 236-42.

SUGGESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION

During the last two years our lessons have not had much discussion. This is probably due to two causes: first, the emergency programs have pushed field men to the limit, leaving little time for anything else; and second, while of interest and value, the subjects have not been vital to the work in progress. The latter of these, at least, will not apply to land-use planning. While we have always planned, and the records show we have been leaders in the past, the new movement finds us unprepared. In addition to that, the movement gives us our biggest opportunity.

As for teachers, there are none; we must largely teach each other, although we can learn also from others in the movement with whom we co-operate. City planning is a science, taught in most of our leading universities, and practiced in all progressive cities. Rural planning, on the broad social lines now conceived, is new. One school has attempted a course, but in reality their so-called course was just a series of lectures on a number of related subjects by specialists in those subjects. But it is a start. It will soon be oriented, correlated and developed into a thing in itself with a technique all its own. Possibly we, too, can make a start, and possibly the following questions may help in getting started.

1. Discuss our old 1912 land classification from the more recent land-use planning point of view. What is lacking, and what would be changed were we doing it now? Did we give proper weight to all uses and all social needs? This should not be a criticism of the old job. That met a definite need in a practical way, and was in advance of its time.

2. The following is an actual case:

“Some eight years ago an application was made for homestead patent on an area known as the Blank Creek Desert. The applicants were veterans of the World War, who were receiving compensation on account of disability.

“We went through the usual routine, and of course turned down the applicants. They filed mining claims. The usual examinations were made, and the mining claims were cancelled.

“The homestead applicants came back, squatted on the desert, built buildings, and a controversy ensued which occupied the time of several local Forest Officers, the Regional Office, and the Washington Office for several years. The Forest Service, as usual, attempted to show that crops could not be grown on the Blank Creek Desert, and that it was more suited to Forest purposes than to any other use. The case became notorious, local citizens took sides, the United States Marshal's Office was called in, several near-shootings occurred, the applicants were finally sentenced to jail, were let out, and immediately went back to the desert again.

“All during this time the Forest Service reiterated and contended that farm crops could not be grown on the desert on account of the lack of soil, adverse climate, etc. The applicants continued to show that they had grown in small, favored areas certain crops, etc. Finally a Secretary's Decision was

secured, which appears to be final, based upon an economic survey of tax delinquencies, and use was made of other and similar lands, even closer to markets, schools and roads. In the final presentation of the case, on which the Secretary's Decision was based, no attempt was made to show whether or not crops could be grown on the Blank Creek Desert. The entire case was planned on straight economics and the proper use of land."

What kind of a land plan would have been a help and saved time in settling this case?

3. Our objective in land use has always been "the greatest good to the greatest number." How do we determine the number? Take some of our common uses, for example range use, commercial sales, recreation, deer range, wilderness areas or forest homesteads. All of these uses, one can readily determine, furnish decided benefits to certain individuals, but to determine which benefits a greater number than some other use would benefit is something else. How do you get at it?

* * * * *

May we have your discussion of this lesson by February 7?



DISCUSSIONS OF PREVIOUS LESSONS

ROY E. MILLER

WASHINGTON OFFICE

WASHINGTON, D. C.

The call for discussion generally means that everything important has already been said. But it does give a highlander on a back seat in the gallery his chance to be heard. Discussion also gives the big guns of the evening a chance to determine which shots went home.

How great, Mr. Hatton, is the obligation of the present to future generations of humanity? Can any generation give more than a partial or provisional answer when the needs of generations may vary as the weather cycles and the attitude of people toward the use of natural resources is as complicated as "the human element" can make it.

There was a local miser who locked the smokehouse and conceded his hungry family the privilege of smelling the smoke. There was also the unlimited "developer" who looked on the hills of China, exploited and devastated to bedrock for 2,000 years, and remarked that there are still plenty of Chinamen.

Fortunately, we do not have to choose between these extreme philosophies in handling natural resources in America. Mr. Hatton swings a keen axe, and does not hesitate to lay it to the root of philosophical wolf-trees that tend to clutter up the field of forestry.

The conservationist is no miser, for all his honest hatred of cut-out-and-get-out theory and wasteful practices in the forest. He is in earnest about finding more human uses and employment of our natural resources, but he does not propose to weaken the hand of enlightened government and permit the people to be flimflammed out of their heritage. It takes constant study of popular

forth the true situation. This will probably result in a verbal and written battle between the stock and game interests, with the Forest Service moved from the position of combatant to that of referee.

The Region 5 method is so good that I hesitate to either criticize or suggest. It seems to me, however, that it is, in its present form, both a survey and an analysis, and more a survey than the latter. From the heading, "Organization," to the "Forest Officer Making Contact," I term a survey, or rather a listing of necessary preliminary knowledge, in order to make an analysis of the actual contact. Since the purpose of the analysis is to discover what to do in order to keep satisfactory relations *status quo*, or establish such where undesirable ones exist, the actual analysis begins with the Forest Officer's statement under the heading, "Opinion of the Forest Officer Regarding User." Merely following this opinion with a statement of action to be taken does not seem sufficient. Either a P. R. problem exists or does not exist, and if one does would it not be a good idea to analyze each problem and have necessary tabulations and space to do so? When the contact man states his opinion of a user he says either good, fair or not good. Two of these suggest a difficulty, and the exact difficulty, if known, should be stated. Following this, the best known reason or reasons for the difficulty should be set forth. By considering these reasons a remedy, if one is possible, should become apparent and set down. The action to be taken will then follow in order as definite instructions along the lines of how and what to do and when and where to do it. Consider, for an example, Maxwell of the Arlington Hotel at Carson. While he is satisfactory, as far as the survey is concerned, the action to be taken suggests a mild problem, since it is desired to "Increase his interest because Legislators stay at his place." Just how to increase his interest, and what is supposed to be done about the legislators, is rather left up in the air. Shouldn't the analysis consider the suggested points and set forth a definite plan of action? While a discussion of some of the problems as an appendix to the survey is desirable, I believe the form should follow through as a tabulation from survey to analysis and through analysis to a solution of each problem. By this method new approaches to P. R. problems will undoubtedly be indicated.

J. V. LEIGHOU

GUNNISON

GUNNISON, COLORADO

It is my belief that game can be made a large item in employment and be self-sustaining. A properly stocked forest with as many streams as the Gunnison should produce sufficient fur alone, even at present prices, to support fifty families. A large part of this would, of course, be from beaver, but at the same time we would be contributing enormously to water conservation and to stream-flow control.

Contrary to the popular conception, aspen is not apparently the main food of beaver, but the mountain willow, swamp grass and roots form a large part of the food.

The normal litter is from two to seven, and young are produced at the age

of two years, so that a hundred per cent increase can be safely figured. This is, of course, only one item of game, but it can be made a large item of revenue around which a system of game management can be built without materially interfering with other resources. Big game are, of course, more difficult to handle, but by using the permit system this can also be handled reasonably. The private land inside the Forest, of course, complicates the control feature, but to me does not seem to offer an insurmountable difficulty. Much of this land should be acquired by exchange or purchase.

Co-operation with the State is apparently an impossibility. We have been trying for many years, but without success. The situation has finally reached the point where the better-informed sportsman would welcome Federal control.

In view of the large amount of game present on some Forests, and the possibilities of development, I feel that one man should be assigned to the staff of such forests for game work. In addition, our work on the various ranger districts should be so organized as to furnish employment to men engaged part time on game protection.



Job No.	4709	
Date	1-10-35	
Ordered for	200	
No. of copies	550	
No. of impressions	600	
Cost:		
Labor	13	50
Overhead		
Stock	2	1/2
Illustrations		
Plates		
Other		
Total	47	43
New composition		Standing
Part Pickups		Overprint
Old plates		